

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

DAVID ST. AMANT,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 05-72900

vs.

HON. GEORGE CARAM STEEH

TAYLOR POLICE DEPT., et al.,

Defendants.

---

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

This matter has come before the Court on plaintiff David St. Amant's motion for reconsideration of the Court's denial of plaintiff's motion to extend discovery. In his motion for reconsideration, plaintiff states that discovery was suspended pending settlement negotiations, and he was unable to complete the depositions of two defendants, and did not pursue discovery to establish a pattern and practice as it pertains to the City of Taylor Police Department.

The Court hereby GRANTS plaintiff's motion for reconsideration, and will permit an additional 60 days of discovery from the date of this order. The Court expects defendants to cooperate in plaintiff's attempts to proceed with discovery during the pendency of defendants' motion for summary judgment.

Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate that there is sufficient reason to believe additional discovery is needed to answer most of the issues raised in defendants' motion for summary judgment. The Court will give plaintiff until May 16 to file his response brief. It is conceivable that plaintiff may be able to demonstrate why the Court

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

DAVID ST. AMANT,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 05-72900

vs.

HON. GEORGE CARAM STEEH

TAYLOR POLICE DEPT., et al.,

Defendants.

---

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

This matter has come before the Court on plaintiff David St. Amant's motion for reconsideration of the Court's denial of plaintiff's motion to extend discovery. In his motion for reconsideration, plaintiff states that discovery was suspended pending settlement negotiations, and he was unable to complete the depositions of two defendants, and did not pursue discovery to establish a pattern and practice as it pertains to the City of Taylor Police Department.

The Court hereby GRANTS plaintiff's motion for reconsideration, and will permit an additional 60 days of discovery from the date of this order. The Court expects defendants to cooperate in plaintiff's attempts to proceed with discovery during the pendency of defendants' motion for summary judgment.

Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate that there is sufficient reason to believe additional discovery is needed to answer most of the issues raised in defendants' motion for summary judgment. The Court will give plaintiff until May 16 to file his response brief. It is conceivable that plaintiff may be able to demonstrate why the Court

should consider delaying a ruling on summary judgment by showing what plaintiff expects discovery to establish in support of his opposition to the defense claims.

It is so ordered.

S/George Caram Steeh  
GEORGE CARAM STEEH  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: May 8, 2006

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Copies of this Order were served on the attorneys of record on May 8, 2006, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

S/Josephine Chaffee  
Secretary/Deputy Clerk

should consider delaying a ruling on summary judgment by showing what plaintiff expects discovery to establish in support of his opposition to the defense claims.

It is so ordered.

S/George Caram Steeh  
GEORGE CARAM STEEH  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: May 8, 2006

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Copies of this Order were served on the attorneys of record on May 8, 2006, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

S/Josephine Chaffee  
Secretary/Deputy Clerk